```
MCG1GRE1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                               17 Cr. 630 (ER)
                 V.
     KARL SEBASTIAN GREENWOOD,
5
6
                     Defendant.
                                               Plea
 7
                                               New York, N.Y.
                                               December 16, 2022
 8
                                                11:19 a.m.
9
10
     Before:
11
                            HON. EDGARDO RAMOS,
12
                                               District Judge
13
                                 APPEARANCES
14
      DAMIAN WILLIAMS
15
           United States Attorney for the
           Southern District of New York
     BY: SAGAR K. RAVI, ESQ.
16
           NICHOLAS FOLLY, ESQ.
17
           Assistant United States Attorneys
           JULIETA V. LOZANO, ESQ.
           Special Assistant United States Attorney
18
     WEDDLE LAW PLLC
19
           Attorneys for Defendant
20
     BY: JUSTIN S. WEDDLE, ESQ.
21
     LAW OFFICE OF HOWARD R. LEADER
           Attorneys for Defendant
22
     BY: HOWARD R. LEADER, ESQ.
23
24
25
```

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MR. RAVI: Good morning, your Honor. Sagar Ravi for the United States, and I'm joined at counsel table by Julieta Lozno, Special Assistant United States attorney.

MR. WEDDLE: Good morning, your Honor. Justin Weddle for Mr. Greenwood, who is sitting to my right, and co-counsel Howard Leader is sitting further to my right.

MS. LOZANO: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning to you all.

Mr. Ravi, what are we doing today?

MR. RAVI: Your Honor, we have a superseding information that we'd like to put on file and that the defendant will be waiving and ultimately pleading guilty to.

THE COURT: Very well.

Before we get started, I note for the record that it is now approximately 20 minutes after the hour for a matter that was scheduled for 11:00. I hope that I don't need to say again that I start on time.

Mr. Greenwood. Actually, Mr. Weddle, will you confirm that is what we are here to do today?

MR. WEDDLE: Yes, your Honor. That is the defendant's intent is to waive indictment, have the superseding information filed, and then plead guilty to that superseding information.

There is no plea agreement, your Honor, but we have received a Pimentel letter.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. RAVI: Your Honor, may I just note, regarding the timing, I just want to apologize. AUSA Nicholas Folly was going to handle this proceeding. He actually had a verdict arrive at a trial that he's been on all this week, and therefore I came over. He may also be stepping in at any point in time.

THE COURT: I'm happy to blame Mr. Folly.

MR. RAVI: Thank you.

me that you wish to enter a plea of guilty to a superseding information. I'm happy to take your plea. However, before I do that, I need to ask you a series of questions, and I'm trying to make two large determinations. The first determination that I need to make is that you understand what is going on here today and the consequences of pleading guilty; and the second determination that I am trying to make is that you are in fact guilty of the crimes to which you wish to plead guilty. In order to make those determinations, I need to ask you a series of questions. It's absolutely vital that you be truthful, so I'm going to have you placed under oath, okay?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please stand and raise your right hand.

(Defendant sworn)

THE COURT: You may be seated. And everyone can remain seated throughout this proceeding, just as long as you have the microphones close to you. You don't need to stand.

Mr. Greenwood, you are now under oath, and do you understand that if you answer any of my questions falsely, your answers could be used against you in a prosecution for perjury or for making a false statement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now as I indicated, I'm going to you ask a series of questions. If I ask you a question and you don't understand it, just let me know that and I'll rephrase it, or if I ask you a question and you wish to speak with your attorneys before you answer it, just let me know that and I'll accommodate you, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So we're going to start with some background questions.

Sir, what is your full name?

THE DEFENDANT: I am Karl Sebastian Greenwood.

THE COURT: And how old are you, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I am 45 years of age.

THE COURT: How far did you get in school?

THE DEFENDANT: I went all the way to a bachelor with honor's degree in the UK.

THE COURT: In the UK? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: So you're able to read and write in 3 4 English? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been 7 under the care of a doctor or psychiatrist? THE DEFENDANT: I am seeing counsel but nothing 8 9 regarding mental health or anything. It's a different issue. 10 THE COURT: So when you say counsel, do you mean a 11 mental health practitioner? 12 THE DEFENDANT: No. 13 THE COURT: A counselor at the facility where you are 14 being held? 15 THE DEFENDANT: No. It's outside counsel, but it's --MR. WEDDLE: If I may, your Honor. He's undergoing 16 17 some counseling, which we'd be happy to describe further for your Honor, perhaps in a sealed proceeding. It doesn't affect 18 his ability to understand the proceedings here today. He also, 19 20 of course, has his lawyers, which I would refer to as outside 21 counsel, but I think he's referring to something different, 22 which is regular counseling sessions. 23 THE COURT: Very well. You may be seated, Mr. Weddle. 24 Are you under any medication as a result of that 25 counseling, Mr. Greenwood?

1	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
2	THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized
3	for any mental illness or any type of addiction, including drug
4	or alcohol addiction?
5	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
6	THE COURT: In the past 24 hours have you taken any
7	drugs, medicine, or pills or have you consumed any alcohol?
8	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
9	THE COURT: Is your mind clear today?
10	MR. WEDDLE: Excuse me, your Honor.
11	(Mr. Weddle conferring with the defendant)
12	THE DEFENDANT: I do take heart medication and also
13	for my asthma, but nothing to affect my mental health.
14	THE COURT: Okay. So you do take a variety of
15	different medications?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes.
17	THE COURT: And do you take them on a daily basis?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And do those medications affect your
20	ability to remember or to think?
21	THE DEFENDANT: No.
22	THE COURT: And have you taken those medications
23	within the last 24 hours?
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25	THE COURT: Okay. And are you feeling well enough to

1	proceed and to understand what is going on here today?
2	THE DEFENDANT: I do, sir.
3	THE COURT: Now your attorney has advised me that you
4	wish to waive indictment and enter a plea of guilty; is that
5	correct?
6	THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: And Mr. Greenwood, have you had a full
8	opportunity to discuss your case with your attorneys, including
9	any possible defenses that you might have?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
11	THE COURT: And have you had a full opportunity to
12	discuss with them the consequences of entering a plea of
13	guilty?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
15	THE COURT: Are you satisfied with your attorneys and
16	their representation of you?
17	THE DEFENDANT: I am, sir.
18	THE COURT: Does either counsel have any doubt as to
19	Mr. Greenwood's competence to waive indictment and enter a
20	guilty plea at this time?
21	MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.
22	MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: The record should reflect that Mr. Folly
24	has joined us.
25	Very well. Based on my observations of the defendant,

his responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor, I find that he is fully competent to waive indictment and enter an informed guilty plea at this time.

So let us turn to the issue of waiver.

Mr. Greenwood, have you received a copy of the superseding information in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: And, sir, do you understand that the document that you've been provided is called a felony information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And do you understand that the information was issued by the United States Attorney in this district,

Damian Williams?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And sir, because the charges against you in that information are serious — indeed, they are felony offenses — you have a constitutional right to require the government to present evidence to a grand jury to see whether the grand jury would vote to charge you with those crimes. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you understand that a grand jury is

24

25

a group made up of at least 16 but not more than 23 citizens 1 and that at least 12 of them would have to agree that there was 2 probable cause to believe that the crimes were committed and 3 4 that you committed them before you could be indicted? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: And if the grand jury voted to charge you, 7 the document they issued would be called an indictment, and it would be signed both by the foreperson of the grand jury and 8 the United States Attorney. Do you understand that? 9 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And Mr. Greenwood, do you wish to give up 12 your right to have your case presented to the grand jury? 13 THE DEFENDANT: I do, sir. 14 THE COURT: Did you discuss that decision thoroughly with your lawyers? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: I have been provided with a document known 18 as a waiver of indictment, and it has a series of signatures, 19 including one that purports to be yours, so I'm going to hold 20 that up. Can you see that from where you're seated? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Is that your signature on this document? 23 THE DEFENDANT: That is, your Honor.

THE COURT: This document will be marked as Court Exhibit No. 1.

And when you signed this document, Mr. Greenwood, did you sign it voluntarily?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, sir.

THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you discuss it with your attorneys?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And when you signed this document, did you understand that you were acknowledging your willingness to give up your right to be indicted by the grand jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did anyone threaten you or force you to give up that right?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. I find that Mr. Greenwood has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to be indicted by the grand jury, and the information will be accepted for filing.

Mr. Weddle, do you wish a public reading of the information?

MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And sir, do you understand that you are charged in that information with three crimes? Count One charges you with conspiracy to commit wire fraud; Count Two charges you with wire fraud; and Count Three charges you with conspiracy to commit money laundering.

Mr. Folly, what are the elements of those offenses?

You can remain seated.

MR. FOLLY: Thank you, your Honor.

As to the wire fraud conspiracy, those elements are as follows:

For conspiracy, the elements are:

First, that the conspiracy charged in the information existed — that is, the existence of an agreement to commit the unlawful object of the conspiracy charged in the information; and

Second, that the defendant wilfully and knowingly became a member of the conspiracy with intent to further its illegal purpose — that is, with the intent to commit the object of the charged conspiracy. Here, as to Count One, the object is wire fraud, and the elements of wire fraud are as follows:

First, the existence of a scheme to defraud or a scheme to defraud others of money or property by false and fraudulent representations or promises;

Second, knowing participation in the scheme to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud; and

Third, the use of interstate or foreign wires.

Count Two charges substantive wire fraud. I've just provided the elements of substantive wire fraud, and those same

elements apply to Count Two.

Count Three charges a money laundering conspiracy. I provided the elements to conspiracy, and those elements apply to Count Three as well. The objects of that conspiracy in Count Three are as follows:

Domestic concealment money laundering. And those elements are:

First, that the defendant knowingly conducted a financial transaction;

Second, that the defendant knew the property involved in the financial transaction was proceeds of some form of unlawful activity;

Third, that the financial transactions in fact involved property constituting proceeds of specified unlawful activity, which here is wire fraud; and

Fourth, that the defendant acted with knowledge that the transaction was designed to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds.

The second object is international concealment money laundering. Those elements are as follows:

First, that the defendant transferred a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside the United States;

Second, that the defendant did so with knowledge that the monetary instrument or funds involved represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity; and

Third, that the defendant did so with knowledge that the transfer was designed in whole or in part to conceal or disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, or control of the proceeds' specified unlawful activity, which here, again, is wire fraud.

And finally, the third object of the money laundering conspiracy charged is international promotional money laundering, and those elements are:

First, that the defendant transported a monetary instrument or funds from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States, or to a place in the United States from or through a place outside the United States; and

Second, that the defendant did so with the intent to promote the carrying on of the specified unlawful activity, which here is wire fraud.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Folly.

Mr. Greenwood, did you hear what the prosecutor said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, sir.

THE COURT: And sir, do you understand that if you did not plead guilty to these three counts, the government would have to prove each and every element of those charges beyond a

reasonable doubt at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, sir.

THE COURT: And Mr. Greenwood, have you discussed with your attorneys the possible punishment that you face if you were to plead guilty to these three counts?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Sir, do you understand that with respect to Count One, that that count carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years and a maximum term of supervised release of three years?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, sir.

THE COURT: And that in addition, there are financial penalties, including a mandatory special assessment that I must impose of \$100, and a fine that I could impose that can be the greater of either \$250,000 or twice the gross gain from the offense or twice the gross loss to any victim of the offense.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And with respect to Count Two, do you understand that that count also carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years and a maximum term of supervised release of three years?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that count also carries financial penalties, including a mandatory special assessment of \$100

that I must impose, and a fine that I could impose that in this count is the greater of either \$1 million or twice the gross gain from the offense or twice the gross loss to any victim of the offense. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And with respect to Count Three, again, that count carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years and a maximum term of supervised release of three years. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And again, the financial penalties of that crime are a \$100 special assessment that I must impose and a fine that I could impose, which in this case is the greater of either \$500,000 or twice the value of the property involved in the transaction. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you further understand that because you are pleading guilty to several counts, Mr. Greenwood, I have the ability to impose the sentences either concurrently, meaning that they will all be served together, or consecutively, meaning that you will be serving one sentence after the others? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you further understand that if I sentence you consecutively, the maximum term of imprisonment

1 | that you are facing is 60 years?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now I used the term "supervised release."

Do you understand that supervised release means that you will be subject to monitoring and supervision when you are released from prison?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And that there are terms and conditions of supervised release with which you must comply, and if you do not comply with them, you could be returned to prison without a jury trial? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And sir, do you understand that if you do violate the terms or conditions of supervised release and are returned to prison, that new term could be for part or all of the term of supervised release and that you will not receive credit for time previously served in prison on your sentence or for time previously served on a prior violation of supervised release? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Greenwood, do you understand that as part of your sentence, I can also order you to pay restitution to any person injured as a result of your conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And Mr. Greenwood, do you further

understand that if I accept your guilty plea and find you guilty, that determination may deprive you of certain valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, the right to possess any kind of firearm, and the right to hold certain professional licenses? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now the next series of questions that we need to go over concern the rights that you are giving up by pleading guilty, so again, please listen very carefully.

First, you have the right to be represented by an attorney at trial and at every other stage of the proceedings. If you could not afford an attorney, an attorney would be appointed to represent you without cost to you. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you which are contained in the information. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: At any trial you would be presumed innocent, and the government would be required to prove your guilt by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty. You would not have to prove that you were innocent at trial. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a jury trial, the jury would be composed of 12 people selected from this district, and all 12 would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty before you could be found guilty. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At trial, you would have the right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you, and your attorney could cross-examine them. Your attorney could object to the government's evidence and offer evidence on your behalf. You would also have the right to have subpoenas issued to compel witnesses to come to court to testify in your defense. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: At trial, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you to testify, and if you chose not to testify, the jury would be told that it could not hold that against you. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you were convicted at trial, you would have the right to appeal that verdict. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand, sir, that by entering a plea of guilty here today, you are giving up all of

the rights that I have just described except for your right to counsel, and you will be found guilty based just on your plea of guilty? Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Greenwood, do you also understand that you can change your mind right now for any reason and decide that you did not want to enter a plea of guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Greenwood, are you a US citizen?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Of what country are you a citizen?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm dual nationality from United Kingdom and Sweden.

THE COURT: And what is your status in this country?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm an inmate. No status.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Weddle, have you advised Mr. Greenwood about the possible immigration consequences of entering a plea of guilty?

MR. WEDDLE: We have, your Honor. Just for the Court's information, Mr. Greenwood was arrested in Thailand and extradited here, so he's virtually never set foot in the United States. I think maybe one or two other occasions. But he's aware that the likely immigration consequences of this conviction are that he will be removed from the United States.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Greenwood, have your lawyers advised you as to the possible immigration consequences of your plea? THE DEFENDANT: They have, your Honor. THE COURT: Sir, do you understand that there could be adverse immigration consequences, including deportation, as a result of your plea? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: So do you understand that if there are adverse immigration consequences, you will not be able to withdraw your plea or appeal or otherwise challenge your conviction on the basis of those immigration consequences? THE DEFENDANT: I do. (Continued on next page) 

THE COURT: Do you further understand that, in all likelihood, you will be deported from the United States after you serve your sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if for some reason you are not deported after serving your sentence, if you are held in the U.S. pending deportation, you will be subject to supervised release?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, sir, do you understand that if you have begun the process of becoming a naturalized U.S. citizen, the fact of your conviction could adversely affect that process?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you further understand the fact of your conviction could adversely affect any application you may make in the future to re-enter the United States?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand if you are deported, returning to the United States during the period of supervised release, without the permission of the U. S. Department of Homeland Security would not only be a separate crime but also a violation of your conditions of supervised release and you could be sent back to prison without a trial? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Now, the next series of questions we need to go over involve sentencing guidelines. So let me begin by asking you, do you understand there are sentencing guidelines that I must consider in determining the appropriate sentence in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you spoken with your lawyers regarding the applicable guidelines in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that I have to calculate the applicable guidelines range and consider that range in determining what your sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, do you understand that I will not be able to make that calculation until after a draft presentence report has been completed by the probation department and that both you and your lawyers have had a chance to review that draft?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that after I receive the final report and calculate the applicable guidelines range in your case, I have the ability to impose a sentence that can be higher or lower than what the guidelines recommend?

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that in addition to determining the applicable guidelines range, I also have to consider a number of other factors set forth in the law, what is Title 18 of the United States Code Section 3553(a), which requires me to consider, among other things, your history and characteristics, and the nature of the offenses to which you are pleading in determining the appropriate sentence in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So even after I calculate the applicable guidelines range, I must also consider these other factors, and again might settle on a sentence higher or lower than what the guidelines recommend.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Sir, do you understand that if your attorney or anyone else has attempted to estimate or predict what your sentence will be, their estimate or prediction could be wrong?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, while it is perfectly appropriate for you and your lawyers to have discussed how the sentence will be calculated, no one can give you any assurance

of what your sentence will be.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, I say all of this to you because you need to understand today that if your sentence is different from what your attorney or anyone else has told you it might be, or if it is different from what you expect, or even if it is different from what is contained in the letter that you receive from the government, you will still be bound by your guilty plea, and you will not be allowed to withdraw your guilty plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, do you understand if you are sentenced to prison, there is no parole in the federal system, and you will not be released early on parole?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Now, the next series of questions we need to go over involve the letter you received from the government. It's a letter dated December 8, 2022, and it is a letter that was provided to you pursuant to the case *United States v.*Pimentel, which is reported at 932 F.2d 1029, a Second Circuit case from 1991.

So, sir, do you understand that this so-called Pimentel letter from the government to your lawyers is just the

government's best guess as of today as to how the sentencing guidelines will operate in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if, between now and the time of your sentencing, the government realizes that it made a mistake, or gets new information, it could take a different position at your sentencing regarding the sentencing range?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: So the letter is not a promise by the government.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that there is nothing in this *Pimentel* letter that is binding on me; that I'm still going to make my own determination as to what the appropriate guidelines range is?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, would the government please summarize what it would expect to prove if this case were expected to proceed to trial?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor.

Were this case to proceed to trial, the government would present evidence at trial, including witness testimony, email evidence, phone evidence, audio recordings, photographs,

promotional one point videos posted online, financial records, and other documentary evidence showing the following:

In 2014, the defendant, Sebastian Greenwood, and co-conspirator Ruja Ignatova cofounded OneCoin, a company based in Sofia, Bulgaria that marketed a purported cryptocurrency named by the same name, which was, in fact, a fraudulent pyramid scheme. The defendant and Ignatova conceived of and built the OneCoin business fully intending to use it to defraud investors.

The defendant was OneCoin's global master distributor and the leader of the multi-level marketing — also known as MLM — network through which the fraudulent cryptocurrency was marketed and sold. OneCoin records show that between the fourth quarter of 2014 and the fourth quarter of 2016 alone, OneCoin generated approximately four billion euros in sales revenue and earned profits of approximately 2.7 billion euros.

The defendant, as well as Ignatova and others, made material misrepresentations to induce victims to purchase OneCoin cryptocurrency packages. Among other things, they falsely represented that the value of OneCoin was determined by market supply and demand when, in fact, OneCoin's value was set by the company itself with no regard for market supply and demand; OneCoin maintained a private blockchain or a digital ledger identifying OneCoins and reporting historical transactions, when, in fact, OneCoin lacked a true blockchain,

that is, a public and verifiable blockchain; and the OneCoin cryptocurrency was "mined" using mining servers maintained and operated by the company when, in fact, OneCoins were never mined using computer resources.

The defendant and other OneCoin representatives knowingly marketed OneCoin cryptocurrency packages to individuals located in the United States. Indeed, Ignatova announced the official opening of the United States market for OneCoin on July 4th, 2015.

As a result of the material misrepresentations by Greenwood, Ignatova, and other OneCoin representatives, victims all over the world invested in fraudulent OneCoin cryptocurrency packages. One or more victims residing in the Southern District of New York invested in such OneCoin packages, which investments involved the use of interstate and foreign wires that passed through the Southern District of New York.

The defendant, Ignatova, and others also engaged in and caused countless financial transactions, some of which were transmitted through corresponding bank accounts and other bank accounts located in the Southern District of New York designed to conceal the nature, location, source, ownership, and control of OneCoin fraud proceeds and to promote the carrying on of the OneCoin fraud scheme. Among other things, approximately \$400 million of OneCoin fraud proceeds were laundered through

the so-called Fenero Funds, which were a series of fraudulent private equity investment funds operated by co-conspirator Mark Scott, which utilized bank accounts in the Cayman Islands and Ireland, among other locations, and involved certain transactions processed through corresponding bank accounts held at a bank located in the Southern District of New York.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Folly.

Mr. Greenwood, did you hear what the prosecutor said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, have you clearly understood everything that has happened here today so far?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, would you now please tell me in your own words what it was that you did that you believe makes you guilty of the three crimes to which you are pleading quilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

MR. WEDDLE: If I may, your Honor, counsel and Mr. Greenwood have worked together on a written statement, and, with the Court's permission, he'd like to read from that statement.

THE COURT: It's perfectly fine for you to read, Mr. Greenwood. I would only ask that you be conscious, because sometimes when people read, they tend to read very quickly.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: That you be very conscious that you read as deliberately as you can so that every word can be taken down accurately.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

Okay. In approximately 2014, I met Ruja Ignatova and assisted her in establishing the OneLife Network, a multi-level marketing company. In addition to buying a membership in the network, network members could also sign up to be independent marketing agents and sell network packages to others and receive commissions on downstream sales. The OneLife Network ostensibly centered around selling financial education packages which include free OneCoin tokens, and the tokens could be converted into OneCoin, which was described as a cryptocurrency. In selling to the network and in seeking to convince buyers to purchase large packages and to sell packages aggressively to others, we deliberately invited comparisons to Bitcoin, a cryptocurrency based on a distributed ledger or blockchain.

Based on this comparison and other marketing techniques, I knew and intended that people would buy into OneCoin and related products based on the misconception that it would be a profitable investment and based on the misconception that OneCoin, like Bitcoin, was a cryptocurrency based on a distributed blockchain and valued by supply and demand. In fact, I knew the company would set and manipulate the stated

value of OneCoin. I participated in this deception by making misrepresentations to convince people that OneCoin would be the next big thing, bigger than Bitcoin, when I knew that it had no intrinsic value.

I also knew that in the second half of 2015, with my participation, the company targeted the United States using these same misrepresentations, including by sending these misrepresentations by wire transmissions into the United States. I also knew that banks were reluctant to accept the proceeds of sales of OneCoin. I therefore agreed with others to conceal the source of those proceeds when engaging in financial transactions. I understood that the same agreement would apply to any of those proceeds coming from the United States market.

At the time I participated in this conspiracy in the United States, I knew what I was doing was wrong.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Greenwood.

When you did the things that you just described,
Mr. Greenwood, did anyone threaten you or force you to do those
things?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does either counsel wish me to make any further inquiries?

Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

1 With respect to the issue of venue, we would refer 2 back to the factual proffer we gave a few moments ago as to what we would prove at trial. 3 4 THE COURT: Mr. Weddle, do you want me to make any 5 further inquiries? 6 MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Weddle, do you believe that there is 8 an adequate factual basis to support the plea? 9 MR. WEDDLE: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Do you know of any reason why your client 11 should not be permitted to plead quilty? MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Mr. Folly, is there an adequate factual 14 basis to support the plea of guilty? 15 MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, how do you now plead to the 16 charge in Count 1 of the information, quilty or not quilty? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: How do you plead to the charge in Count 2 20 of the information, quilty or not quilty? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: How do you plead to the charge in Count 3 23 of the information, quilty or not quilty? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Are you, in fact, guilty of those charges,

1 sir?

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

allegations.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of

4 | your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there a forfeiture allegation in the

7 | information?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor. I believe there is.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenwood, do you admit to the forfeiture allegation in the information?

MR. WEDDLE: Your Honor, if I may interrupt briefly?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WEDDLE: We have a proposal for how to essentially organize the case between now and sentencing, and I've discussed it with the prosecution. And I think we're in agreement in how to essentially tee up the issues for your Honor's decision and to sort of get to sentencing in the most efficient way. I think that the forfeiture plays together with those issues, and I'm happy to discuss them more right now or, if your Honor would like to finish the plea proceeding and then we could take that up, but I don't think it's necessary for Mr. Greenwood right now at this moment to admit the forfeiture

THE COURT: I think that's probably right.

Any objection to that, Mr. Folly?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Greenwood, because you acknowledge that you are, in fact, guilty as charged in Counts 1 through 3 of the superseding information, because I find that you know your rights and are waiving them knowingly and voluntarily with an understanding of the consequences of the plea, including the potential sentences that may be imposed, I accept your guilty plea and find you guilty of those three charges.

I will now direct that a presentence investigation be conducted by the probation office, and that a presentence report be prepared. You will be interviewed by the probation office as part of that process. You can and should have your lawyers with you when you are interviewed. You will receive a draft of the presentence report before I receive it, and when you receive the draft, please review it very carefully with your attorneys and bring to my attention any mistakes or discrepancies that you may find therein. The presentence report is a very important part in my decision as to what the sentence will be, but both you and your attorneys will have an opportunity to speak on your behalf before I impose sentence.

If I could just impose on defense counsel to coordinate with probation so the interview can take place within -- I guess the next couple of weeks may be difficult because of the holidays but within the next few weeks.

25

1 MR. WEDDLE: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Very well. Do we have a date for 3 sentencing? 4 MR. WEDDLE: Well, your Honor, if I may -- does your 5 Honor prefer that I sit? 6 THE COURT: It's up to you. 7 MR. WEDDLE: I'm a little bit more comfortable --THE COURT: As long as you're close to the microphone. 8 9 MR. WEDDLE: It makes me feel weird to sit down. 10 THE COURT: I understand. 11 MR. WEDDLE: So as I mentioned, your Honor, we have a 12 proposal for how to organize the issues going forward, and just 13 to preview for your Honor, the major dispute that we have 14 between the parties has to do with a fundamental legal question 15 about how the quidelines should be applied. And the fundamental legal issue about how the guidelines should be 16 17 applied dovetails with some of the briefing and argument that your Honor has heard in the Mark Scott case, because it has to 18 do with whether the guidelines should be applied to worldwide 19 20 conduct or whether the quidelines should be applied to U.S. 21 based conduct. And we've shared with the government our 22 argument about this. They disagree. And the parties plan to 23 present the issue to your Honor for decision. 24

What we think makes the most sense is to set a briefing schedule on this fundamental legal issue and submit

briefs and hopefully get a decision from your Honor as step one of the process. Step two of the process is then to apply that legal decision to the facts. And it's hard to know right now, without knowing the legal decision, how difficult or contested step two may be, so if your Honor says that the guidelines apply to global conduct, then the parties may need to have a contested hearing or some kind of truncated version of a hearing about what that means in terms of the evidence of global conduct. And, likewise, if your Honor decided that the guidelines should apply to U.S. based conduct, we'd want to have a discussion with the government about what is the evidence that quantifies U.S. based conduct and do we need to have a contested proceeding on that or some truncated version of it or should we agree on it. So that's step two.

And then step three is simply to proceed to sentencing with all of the 3553(a) factors, and as your Honor I'm sure can predict, there are very substantial 3553(a) arguments to be made on behalf of Mr. Greenwood in this case after the guidelines issues have been determined.

So what we had proposed was a briefing schedule roughly as follows, which was that we would submit a brief to your Honor arguing that the guidelines should be based on U.S. based conduct, and, you know, we've shared some of the case law with the government. Particularly, there's a Second Circuit case called Azeem, and a number of other cases that you've

seen, and it's got briefing that we think supports this argument. And we would submit that brief January 20th. The government would submit an opposition brief or a responsive brief on February 10th, and then we would reply February 22nd.

Hopefully, at the Court's convenience, sometime shortly thereafter we could set a date for an oral argument to answer any questions your Honor may have about the briefing.

And then hopefully we could get a decision on this abstract legal issue from your Honor, and then we could come back either after discussing it among the parties or something to propose kind of a schedule going forward from there for step two and step three.

We think that it -- and, again, I've discussed this whole thing with the prosecution here, but we think it makes sense to set a sentencing control date four months out. In addition, our client is eager to move this process to conclusion. So we welcome the opportunity to begin the presentence investigation report and conduct the background part of that. We would prefer that probation be instructed or invited not to opine on the guidelines issue that we are all briefing to your Honor simultaneously, but what we hope is that probation could do the bulk of their work on the PSR in parallel to that process. And then, getting a decision from your Honor, they could come up with their opinion on the guidelines application or recommendation.

Obviously, you know, the parties could discuss or agree how the legal decision applies to the facts to come up with an actual guidelines calculation. And I think after step two, whatever it ends up being, your Honor could, in fact, make a guidelines calculation, and then we could do papers on 3553(a) factors or those two things could be combined together.

But that's our proposal in terms of just organizing issues going forward and making sure that these fundamental legal disputes between the parties can get decided in the most efficient way without slowing down the entire process.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, have you discussed the schedule with Mr. Weddle and do you consent?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, we have discussed that schedule and the specific dates provided by Mr. Weddle, and we don't have an objection to that. We would request, if the Court is amenable, to setting the oral argument date approximately a week after the completion of the reply brief.

THE COURT: That would be February 27?

MR. FOLLY: Was that right?

MR. WEDDLE: That would be one week later, yes.

That's a Wednesday, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Rivera, are we available?

MR. WEDDLE: Wait. I'm sorry. I had that wrong. We had proposed a reply brief of the 22nd, so a week later would

25 be March 1st.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WEDDLE: The 27th is three business days later.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, you are available on March 1 at 2:00 p.m.

THE COURT: Should we get a date for sentencing, at least a control date, for early April?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: April 5 at 2:00.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, I won't hold anyone to the amounts which you may or may not want to provide now, but what are we talking about in terms of the difference between U.S. only conduct versus extraterritorial conduct? Is it a substantial percentage of the overall potential loss amount?

MR. WEDDLE: It's a very small percentage, your Honor, but it's still a substantial number depending on how convincing you find some of the evidence to be. You know, there was a \$57,000 figure that was in the Mark Scott briefing. I don't know -- you know, it's the government's burden to come up with the proof here. I would imagine that they may be able to proffer evidence of more than those two U.S. victims and come up with a number that's larger than the \$57,000, but obviously the global numbers are very large. And, depending on how much you believe the proffer, for example, from Mr. Folly today, you know, the top of the guidelines loss table maxes out at 550 million.

So it's a substantial difference in terms of the

guidelines calculation. I think it's a substantial difference in terms of the legal principles at stake about whether or not the United States should be, you know, engaging in global policing or should be enforcing U.S. law that is of domestic application domestically.

So I think there are important principles at stake, but because we haven't teed this up yet, we have not had a good — I think neither side has had a good opportunity to really focus on what exactly is the evidence of U.S. based losses and to evaluate the strength of that evidence and what number it shows. But I think it's going to be a number that's, you know, within the realm of reason as compared to the top of the guideline range.

THE COURT: I'm not going to hold anyone to these figures, but we're talking about a figure between 57,000 and 500 million?

MR. WEDDLE: I don't think that's what the Court's decision is going to be, but we're going to have to see what the evidence is. There was a footnote in I think one of Mr. Scott's briefs that referenced a government affidavit about the percentage of OneCoin membership that was in the United States versus elsewhere, and that number was one and a half percent. I think that — I don't know if that's proveable by the government, but if that was provable, I think that would set a ceiling on the number, and one and a half percent of a

couple billion dollars is, you know, still tens of millions of dollars.

THE COURT: Mr. Folly, anything you wanted to put on the record?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, I think we were talking about a significant difference between the global investor losses versus just U.S. investors, and, you know, global investor losses is going to be in the billions whereas U.S. investor losses are going to be in the tens of millions.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well. So I look forward to receiving your papers.

Is there anything else that we should do today, Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, one piece of housekeeping in light of the two additional open counts that the defendant did not plead guilty to here today. The government would move to exclude time on those counts through the current April 5th control date for the sentencing. We understand defense counsel does not have an objection to that. And we would also move to adjourn the current trial date indefinitely in light of this plea and the current status of the case.

THE COURT: I guess I'm a little perplexed by the request. If he's plead guilty and the only issues that we're talking about are what will the length of the sentence be, why would we need to adjourn a trial that's not going to go

forward?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, we do not believe a trial will need to go forward. However, there is not a judgment of conviction as to these counts yet. Those counts are still open on the underlying indictment. So in an abundance of caution, we would move to exclude time on those counts and just adjourn the trial date indefinitely.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. That time will be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.

I find that Mr. Greenwood's interest in having these issues finally determined outweigh — these very substantial issues concerning the guidelines outweigh the interest of the public in a speedy trial, so that time will be excluded until April 5, was it?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: Until April 5.

Anything more?

Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Weddle?

MR. WEDDLE: Just, your Honor, I made a long speech, but at the close of the plea proceeding, your Honor directed the preparation of the presentence investigation report. And

as I said, we agree it should start, but can I impose on your Honor to recommend or direct probation not to conduct a guidelines analysis while we're trying to brief the issues? THE COURT: Any objection to that, Mr. Folly? MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor. THE COURT: I mean, I'm happy to do that, although probation only makes a recommendation, so it would be to no particular legal effect, but I will make that recommendation. Okay. Folks, we are adjourned. (Adjourned)